DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 917 RE 003 821

AUTHOR Smith, Carl B.; Farr, Roger
TITLE Evaluation Training: Simulation Exercises.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Measurement and Evaluation Center in Reading Education.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 98p.; Second Edition
AVAILABLE FROM Reading Program, School of Education, Indiana University, 202 Pine Hall, Bloomington, Indiana 47401 ($4.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Conceptual Schemes; *Evaluation; Evaluation Techniques; *Instructional Materials; Models; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; *Simulation; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The preparation of this simulation material package is guided by the concept of an evaluator as a decision-maker, based on the definition of evaluation as a continuous assessment concerned with answering decision-making questions. The continuous concept of evaluation is based on the model created by Egon Guba and Daniel Stufflebeam, named by its acronym CIPP--context, input, process, and product evaluation. Sections are devoted to describe and explain the CIPP evaluation model. The intent of this evaluation game is to provide an instructional tool for applying the concept of continuous evaluation to a reading program. Its specific goal is to teach the participant to use one evaluation model as a guide to knowing what to do and what to decide. The materials describe a school system that hires an evaluator who must help conceive a reading program as well as assess it. The incidents described try to simulate actual school situations. There are three kinds of pages in this simulation game, each marked by a different color: white pages carry descriptions of situations, green pages are response sheets, and pink pages carry the "omniscient comments" or answers proposed by the authors. (AW)

ED054917

EVALUATION TRAINING PACKAGE

PROGRAM IN READING, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,
INDIANA UNIVERSITY, 202 PINE HALL, BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

EVALUATION TRAINING
(Simulation Exercises)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Carl B. Smith

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Carl B. Smith

Roger Farr

Indiana University,
Bloomington, Indiana

Second Edition, 1971

The original materials (1969) were developed under grants from the H.E.W., U.S.O.E., No. OEG 9-090473-4231-010 and No. OEG 0-0-247053-3589(721).

Measurement and Evaluation Center in Reading Education
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

These materials are not to be copied,
reproduced, or ditributed in any
manner without the written permission
of the publisher.

Various staff members of the Measurement and Evaluation Center in Reading Education provided ideas and assistance in the development of these materials. Specific contributions are not always possible to acknowledge after a program has gone through an eighteen month development process, but the ideas and the aid that the following people provided are much appreciated:

Arnelle Adcock
Deborah Alexander
Nancy Andrews
Terry Bruce
William Furlong
George Kozacik
Alice Kufel
Steen Levy
Ed Robbins

Measurement and Evaluation Center
in Reading Education (MECRE)
Pine Hall 218
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

INTRODUCTION

Definition of Evaluation

In the last two or three decades evaluation has been a changing concept. The term has been used to encompass a variety of activities: conducting experimental research, grading people, judging subject areas by general lists of criteria, comparing scores from standardized tests, or even giving "gut" reactions to programs under consideration.

As evaluation is defined in this project, however, it is a disciplined system for helping decision-makers: evaluation is a continuous assessment concerned with answering decision-making questions. For example, at the beginning of a project a decision-making question is: "What should this Title I project focus on?" At the end of the project another decision-making question has to be asked: "Is this reading program worth continuing next year?" And, of course, there are many other decision-making questions during the course of the project.

Several educators have attempted to describe continuous evaluation using different diagrams and terminology. Michael Scriven speaks of formative evaluation (evaluating a program as it is being developed and carried forward) and summative evaluation (evaluating a program when everything is finished). In other words, how does it all add up? Robert Stake talks about antecedents (What exists prior to the project?), intentions (What are the goals of the project?), and transactions and outcomes (What has happened as the project has developed that will affect the results?).

The continuous concept used in the Simulation Training Package, however, is the evaluation model created by Egon Guba and Daniel Stufflebeam. Their model is named by its acronym CIPP -- context, input, process, and product evaluation. The phases indicate a constant concern for evaluating a project

from the initial stages of determining needs to the concluding stages of examining the final product.

Continuous evaluation includes several basic activities: creating a proper climate for evaluation, training personnel to become sensitive to decision-making stimuli, collecting data for feedback, modifying operations, and emphasizing decision-making for all project personnel.

Part of the evaluator's responsibility is to create the proper climate for evaluation. Therefore, the evaluator is not a data collection technician but rather a manager with plans to carry on evaluation throughout the course of the project. Additional personnel must be trained, however. Evaluators, most of whom have other responsibilities, cannot possibly conduct all of the evaluation activity personally, so they must train other people to help. But, these added personnel must be oriented and made sensitive to decision-making stimuli. For example, a superintendent or a principal will be pressured by P.T.A. groups, community action groups, or student groups to install additional equipment or to alter a curriculum. An evaluator should be sensitive to these pressures and try to foresee them so that he has some plan, some program ready to meet the problems associated with pressures on the decision-maker.

Collecting data to feed back into the program to constantly modify the operations is another phase of continuous evaluation. Decisions must be made often if a program is to remain up-dated.

In developing a curriculum there are many levels of decision-making as well as many different roles for decision-makers. From the federal level to the local level, decisions are made about the value of projects. For example, the U. S. Office of Education must decide whether or not its Title I money is buying services that are improving the reading of disadvantaged

students. Also, the Office of Education must collect data about their programs before asking Congress to continue them. On the local level, too, a superintendent must decide whether or not the project would benefit his system. And, finally, a teacher decides if project data indicate benefits to her class. An evaluator, therefore, cannot collect all of this data himself, so he must train and involve these personnel in collecting information that will enable them to make accurate decisions.

What determines how a decision is made? If the definition of evaluation is focusing, delineating, and collecting data for answering decision-making questions, then the criteria for evaluation will come from each decision to be made. Criteria such as relevancy, timeliness, economy, and feasibility will be applied to a project to determine how it will proceed.

Individualized criteria for each project require that data be collected by measures other than standardized reading tests and group standardized intelligence tests. The hard data from tests still have to be collected, but other information is also needed to answer decision-making questions -- questionnaires, interviews, attitude inventories, and so on. Therefore, the evaluator's plan must identify the kinds of data that will be needed, the way they will be collected, the people who will collect them, the best way of using the data to answer the questions, and the means of interpreting them.

Two types of decisions made in continuous evaluation are congruency decisions and contingency decisions. Congruency decisions determine whether or not products and outcomes match objectives. For example, a teacher requesting students to read five books outside of class during the course of a semester must also examine his procedures to discover if students are reading the books, if the available materials are being used, and if more materials should be purchased.

Contingency decisions are concerned with determining the effectiveness of existing operations. Possible situations requiring contingency decisions would be these: Does an informal reading inventory enable a teacher to adequately diagnose disadvantaged children? If a crisis occurs, the directors of a project must decide whether or not their program should be modified. Those are contingency decisions.

Another aspect of the continuous evaluation definition, which is not immediately apparent, is that educators must be accountable for the dollars and the time spent on educational programs. Accountability should not be equated with money, even though money is where emphasis is often placed. In the past, evaluation reports were descriptions. The current definition of evaluation, however, pictures the evaluator not only as a describer but also as an interpreter of events that will help decision-makers make their assessments. Therefore, the evaluator must have plans for selecting and interpreting data, as well as for providing information in a usable form for the decision-makers -- the consumers of that information.

Role of the Evaluator

What implications for the role of an evaluator are inherent in the continuous evaluation concept? His work is not finding answers to problems; finding answers is the goal of evaluation. He is neither a data collection technician, nor is he limited to merely producing descriptive data. Rather, the role of an evaluator embraces dual responsibilities as manager and as judge. An evaluator is a manager of data; he specifies objectives, monitors processes, collects data, assesses and interprets data, and writes reports. Necessarily, he must create an evaluation climate and then ask questions that will focus the decision-maker's eyes on apprpriate actions that accomplish stated goals.

In terms of a role then, the evaluator is not an adjunct, a barnacle on the side of the decision-making vessel. He is rather a participator in the decision-making process. Moreover, the evaluator may even develop the managerial plan for a project -- identifying the objectives and goals as well as the contingency and congruency decision points. He brings information to the decision-maker and helps him disseminate it, if dissemination beyond the decision-maker is needed. As soon as feedback to the consumer has been accomplished, the evaluator's job, in a sense, is complete. However, feedback to the decision-maker means feedback into the program and that recycling continually involves the evaluator.

The concepts of a participating evaluator and of continuing evaluation guided the preparation of the materials in the Simulation Training Package.

CIPP

A Concept for Evaluation

A person who has the responsibility for evaluating a reading program faces the task of determining what program he will examine as well as what data he will collect in order to make a judgment about the value of a program. Several educators are now theorizing about appropriate strategies for evaluation. They are proposing a number of concepts or models in which the practicing evaluator can operate. The bibliography identifies several theoretical models for evaluation, but these training materials use a model developed by Egon Guba and Daniel Stufflebeam as the framework in which it discusses the evaluation of reading programs. This model was chosen for two reasons: it is simple and it has suffered through the revision of time and trial.

The model that appears in these materials is called the CIPP Model, an acronym standing for Context, Input, Process, Product. It is based upon the assumption that educational programs should be evaluated on a continuous basis, from start to finish, rather than on the final product alone. In other words, an evaluator should be part of the team that looks at the needs of the school and determines the kind of program the school needs to teach reading more effectively. And he should continue to be involved with the program throughout its movement toward the end product. Context, input, process, and product refer to various stages of a program's movement toward completion.

Context evaluation is concerned with the setting or the environment in which education is taking place. It includes the community, the children, the teachers, the buildings, and the present approaches used to

teach reading. The basic question that has to be answered under the heading of context evaluation is, "What are the needs that should be satisfied?"

Input evaluation translates the decision made under context to specific objectives and procedures for achieving the general objective implied in the context decision. The answers to, "What are the best means to solve the need or the problem?" provide the program plan and its procedures.

Process evaluation is an examination of the program as it functions to see if the program plan meets expectations or if modifications should be made in operations. This kind of evaluation not only wants to see whether everything works or not, but also wants to provide an avenue for making modifications where the need indicates.

Product evaluation analyzes the results to see if the objectives of the project were met. Some evaluators refer to this kind of assessment as summative evaluation. Typically, product or summative evaluation is the only kind of formal evaluation provided in program assessment.

Reading and the CIPP Model

It is not enough merely to point out to evaluators a conceptual framework within which to operate. People must first develop an attitude that encourages high performance in a given area and identify and become skilled in the tools of that subject. Therefore, the objective of these materials goes beyond identifying the CIPP Model as a means for conceptualizing evaluation. It is necessary in addition, to see how reading programs fit into that framework and to learn how to use the tools that will effectively collect data on reading programs.

What are the variables in a reading program that an evalutor wants to concern himself with? How can he identify needs related to the reading program, especially a reading program for disadvantaged youngsters? What are appropriate behaviors that can be expected of youngsters? What terminology has to be used to express those behaviors for reading teachers and for administrators? What are the major decision-making questions that have to be answered about reading in terms of objectives, procedures, and final performance? What instruments and techniques can be used to monitor the reading process and the teaching techniques that attempt to produce adequate reading behavior? What background and skills should a reading teacher be expected to have? How does one assess the reading performance of the students? These specific questions make it essential for evaluators and reading specialists to work together. These training materials help to identify ways in which the evaluator and other specialists contribute to the evaluation of reading.

TABLE A

THE CIPP EVALUATION MODEL*

A Classification Scheme of Strategies for Evaluating Educational Change

	CONTEXT EVALUATION	INPUT EVALUATION
OBJECTIVE	To define the operation context, to identify and assess needs in the context, and to identify and delineate problems underlying the needs.	To identify and assess system capabilities, available input strategies, and designs for implementing the strategies.
METHOD	By describing individually and in relevant perspective the major sub-systems of the context; by comparing actual and intended inputs and outputs of the subsystems; and by analyzing possible causes of discrepancies between actualities and intentions.	By describing and analyzing available human and material resources, solution strategies and procedural designs for relevance, feasibility and economy in the course of action to be taken.
RELATION TO DECISION-MAKING IN THE CHANGE PROCESS	For deciding upon the setting to be served, the goals associated with meeting needs and the objectives associated with solving problems, i.e., for planning needed changes.	For selecting sources of support, solution strategies and procedural designs, i.e., for programing change activities.

Sources: Daniel L. Stufflebeam, "Evaluation as Enlightenment for Decision-Making," an address delivered at the Working Conference on Assessment Theory, The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, January, Washington, D. C., 1968.

THE CIPP EVALUATION MODEL (continued)

	PROCESS EVALUATION	PRODUCT EVALUATION
OBJECTIVE	To identify or predict in process defects in the procedural design or its implementation, and to maintain a record of procedural events and activities.	To relate outcome information to objectives and to context, input, and process information.
METHOD	By monitoring the activity's potential procedural barriers and remaining alert to unanticipated ones.	By defining operationally and measuring criteria associated with the objectives, by comparing these measurements with predetermined standards or comparative bases and by interpreting the outcome in terms of recorded input and process information.
RELATION TO DECISION-MAKING IN THE CHANGE PROCESS	For implementing and refining the program design and procedure, i.e., for effecting process control.	For deciding to continue, terminate, modify, or refocus a change activity and for linking the activity to other major phases of the change process, i.e., for evolving change activities.

TABLE B
DEVELOPING EVALUATING DESIGNS OUTLINE*

The logical structure of evaluation design is the same for all type of evaluation, whether context, input, process, or product evaluation.

A. Focusing the Evaluation
   1. Identify the major level(s) of decision-making to be served, e.g., local, state, or national.
   2. For each level of decision-making, project the decision situations to be served and describe each one in terms of its locus, focus, criticality, timing, and composition of alternatives.
   3. Define criteria for each decision situation by specifying variables for measurement and standards for use in the judgment of alternatives.
   4. Define policies within which the evaluation must operate.

B. Collection of Information
   1. Specify the source of the information to be collected.
   2. Specify the instruments and methods for collecting the needed information.
   3. Specify the sampling procedure to be employed.
   4. Specify the conditions and schedule for information collection.

C. Organization of Information
   1. Provide a format for the information which is to be collected.
   2. Designate a means for coding, organizing, storing, and retrieving information.

D. Analysis of Information
   1. Select the analytical procedures to be employed.
   2. Designate a means for performing the analysis.

E. Reporting of Information
   1. Define the audiences for the evaluation reports.
   2. Specify means for providing information to the audiences.
   3. Specify the format for evaluation reports and/or reporting sessions.
   4. Schedule the reporting of information.

F. Administration of the Evaluation
   1. Summarize the evaluation schedule.
   2. Define staff and resource requirements and plans for meeting these requirements.
   3. Specify means for meeting policy requirements for conduct of the evaluation.
   4. Evaluate the potential of the evaluation design for providing information which is valid, reliable, credible, timely, and pervasive.
   5. Specify and schedule means for periodic updating of the evaluation design.
   6. Provide a budget for the total evaluation program.

*Daniel L. Stufflebeam, "Evaluation as Enlightenment for Decision-Making," p. 42.

TABLE C

CIPP MODEL

A. Context evaluation

1. Identify a problem (unmet need).
2. Focus the problem.
3. Determine criteria for problem selection.
4. Collect data on problem areas.
5. Determine system (organization, facilities, materials, schedules, teachers, community, etc.) capabilities.
6. Select specific problem based on above criteria.

B. Input evaluation

1. Determine broad objectives or goals for any possible alternatives for meeting problem.
2. Specify criteria for program alternative selection.
3. Gather and/or develop possible program alternatives.
4. Assess alternatives based on criteria specified.
5. Select alternatives and refine objectives and program description.

C. Process evaluation

1. Develop plan for constantly monitoring program. Plan should be contingent on --
    a. Decision-maker
    b. Decision to be made
    c. Type of decision to be made
    d. Timing of decision
    e. Data collection capabilities
    f. Flexibility possible within program
2. Assist staff in focusing problems as they arise; assess alternative strategies for meeting problem and monitor effectiveness of alternatives selected.
3. Implement monitoring plan.

D. Product evaluation

1. Develop plan for collecting data on program goals and objectives. (Different levels of authority are interested in different objectives and goals.) Plan should be contingent on --
    a. Decision-maker
    b. Decision to be made
    c. Type of decision to be made
    d. Timing of decision
    e. Data collection capabilities.

Directions

How to Use the Simulation Training Materials

The pages which follow are called simulation training materials. They describe a school system that hires an evaluator who must help conceive a reading program as well as assess it. The incidents in these pages try to picture (simulate) the kinds of things that occur in actual situations.

In order to achieve the intent of the materials, the participant should "play the game." And this is indeed a <u>game</u> for educators interested in improving programs through better decision-making processes. But playing the game necessarily limits freedom of response. Evidently the limits of a book prevent the participant from following to a conclusion some game-decisions that he makes, even though they may be better decisions than the ones proposed in the authors' game plan. Thus, make hypothetical decisions in these pages, but accept the decision that the authors give in their "omniscient comment."

The intent of this evaluation game is to provide an instructional tool, a vehicle, for applying the concept of continuous evaluation to an educational program, a reading program. It has the more specific intent of teaching the participant to use one evaluation model as a guide to knowing what to do and what to decide. Again -- the authors understand, as you do, that there are several models that could be used. The CIPP model has been selected as a sample model, and hopefully a sample model that is complete and that provides a series of clear steps to guide the evaluator throughout.

<u>Format</u>

There are three kinds of pages in this simulation game, each marked by a different color. White pages carry the description of how things are progressing in Giz, Mo., Unified School District. White is real life. Green

pages are "Response Sheets" where you react or make a decision in the real-life world of Giz. Pink pages carry the "Omniscient Comments" or the answers.

The response sheets (green) should be used as desk scratch pads. Make notes about what a situation is and how a problem can be handled. Do not look at the "omniscient comments" (pink) until you have made your response on the green sheets. Though the pink sheets are called "Onmiscient Comments," they are actually only plausible alternative solutions -- not necessarily the best. But they are the decisions and the solutions that the participant has to accept in order to proceed and to continue to "play the game."

CLARIFICATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

a) The term individualized reading is used here to mean any method that will provide more attention to the needs of individuals.

b) This is a Title I reading project and so references to schools and children mean target area schools and disadvantaged children.

c) A companion book to this training package is a collection of assessment instruments: Taxonomy of Evaluation Techniques for Reading Programs, available from the Measurement and Evaluation Center in Reading Education, 218 Pine Hall, Bloomington, Indiana.

Situation:

You have been hired by the Giz Unified School District to assist in the development and evaluation of a Title I reading project. (The District hopes to net $100,000 from the Federal government for the upcoming project.) The superintendent, Dr. R. Leader, was especially interested in hiring you because you possessed expertise in both evaluation and reading. However, he informed you that your evaluation expertise was the key to your being hired, as the school district already employs an elementary curriculum consultant who is considered an expert in reading. Specifically, you have been asked to assist in the program development as well as to guide the project through its development. Your job is not to develop this proposal by yourself but to utilize your techniques and skills of evaluation to monitor the program development and implementation.

Giz is similar to many school districts of the same size and socio-economic status. (See school background information sheet.) However, one important difference exists at Giz. Dr. R. Leader is convinced that program development should be based on valid and reliable evaluation. He attended a national conference last year where Dr. Gubblebeam of Ohiena State University discussed the value and need for continuous program evaluation. Additionally, Dr. Leader has been getting increased demands for evaluation reports about his school programs from: (1) local groups interested in the school; (2) the local Board of Education; (3) the State Department of Education; (4) the U. S. Office of Education.

When you were hired, Dr. Leader told you that he wanted to build a solid Title I reading program based on sound evaluation. However, he also warned that some individuals in the school and in the community would not

take too kindly to the idea of "being evaluated." Even though he was supporting the idea of a broad concept of evaluation, he was advising that you should not begin by gathering data "all over the place." He ended this initial meeting by saying, "You've got to show the staff that this evaluation stuff is <u>not</u> going to be directed at them. If they think you are criticizing their work, you'll be in trouble, and I won't be able to bail you out."

<u>First day on the job</u>:

You have had the following items to read, some of which are attached:

1. Title I project applicant book (not included here)
2. School background information (pp. 18-19)
3. Job description (p. 20)

While setting up office files, getting to know the staff (you've taken several coffee breaks), and studying the above items, you are interrupted by a call from Dr. Leader's secretary. She is sending you some items related to the reading program that Dr. Leader thinks will interest you. The following items arrive at your desk an hour later:

1. An article from the local paper (p. 21)
2. A report from the local PTA (p. 22)
3. A letter to Dr. Leader from Ins Tructor, a teacher in the district who took a graduate research course the past summer and used the school test results in her research project. (p. 23)
4. A memo of a recent phone call Dr. Leader had from Ms. I. Rate. (p. 24)
5. A memo from Dr. Leader concerning a previous in-service program.(p. 25)

APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE
for the Education of Children from Low-Income Families
under Title I of Public Law 89-10

PART I - BASIC DATA

1 AVERAGE PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE: Non-fed. fds.

A	2nd previous year	$ 270.00
B	Previous year	$ 294.00
C	Current year	$ 298.00

2 PUBLIC SCHOOLS OPERATED BY LEA

A	Total # of Schools	6
B	Total Enrollment	14,000
C	Grade Span	1-12

3 CHILDREN RESID. IN APPLIC. DIST. OF AN AGE APPROP. TO ATTEND SCH. OP. BY DIST.

	Number of children	Number
A	Enrolled in Public Sch.	14,100
B	Enrolled in Non-Pub. Sch.	138
C	Not enrolled in any Sch.	184 est.
D	(add A, B, & C) Total	14,422
E	Number of children (D) who come from low-income families	628

4 Concentration of children fr. lo-income fam. in dist.

A	District-Wide per cent. (Item 3E ÷ 3D)	4.35%	
B	Avg. # per school att. area (3E ÷ 2A)	35	

APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE (continued)

6 Attendance areas eligible for Title I Proj.

Name of Public School	# Child. residing attend. area svd.		
	Total	lo-income families #	% Col. 3 ÷ 2
	2	3	4
Benton Elem.	300est	54	18.0
Lincoln Elem.	550est	68	12.51
Jefferson Elem.	875est	103	11.82
Kennedy Elem.	300est	26	8.66
GIZ Jr. High	1225est	101	8.30
GIZ High School	1750est	140	8.02

7 Characteristics of educationally deprived child. (residing in eligible attendance areas) which ind. their need for special educational assistance und. Title I. (See instructions for code # & character.)

	Characteristics of Children	Grade Level (child)	# of children
	1	2	3
11	Poor performance on standardized tests	ES	251
24	Other ability characteristics (Mental)	ES	377
35	Other attitude characteristics (Dislike for school)	ES	238
43	Disciplinary Problems	S	119
44	Low Attention Span	E	30
51	Poor Health	ES	199
52	Malnutrition	ES	75
68	Other Health Impaired	ES	21

CERTIFICATION OF LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY

I CERTIFY that, to the best of my knowledge, the information herein is correct and complete.

Legal Name of Local Educational Agency: GIZ Unified School District	Name and Title of Authorized LEA Representative: R. Leader, Superintendent
Mailing Address (Street, City, Town, Zip): 161 School Lane, GIZ	Signature: R. Leader
County: Tipsy / State: Missouri	Telephone (Area code & No.): 000 1112345 / Date Signed:
Name and address of Contact Person:	Telephone: Signature: / Date:

JOB DESCRIPTION

Title: District Evaluator

Description:

The evaluator shall be in charge of evaluation of all district Title I Reading projects and programs. Because of the dual responsibilities of his position, he must be an expert in reading content as well as in evaluation technique. The evaluator shall be involved in all projects from the formulation of the project design to the evaluation of project end results. Moreover, the evaluator shall be in charge of preparing evaluation reports and disseminating the information to interested parties.

News Clipping

JOHNNY CAN'T
BUT ELMER CAN
IN BIG CITY

Giz, September 13--Mrs. Mary Smity, a noted educator from Big City, was the guest speaker for the first session of the Community Action Project's orientation for the After School Tutoring Program. Mrs. Smith described a highly successful reading program now in progress in one of Big City's schools. She was very enthusiastic about the program. Since the beginning of the program, there has been much more interest in reading and the students' reading skills have improved.

Mrs. Smith described a typical classroom. Children may choose from a variety of books screened for reading level. The students are involved in charting their reading progress as they meet individually with the teacher several times a week to check their skills.

"The variety of highly relevant materials, the individual work with the teacher, and the continual reinforcement from the progress reports are factors which account for the success of the program," Mrs. Smith stated.

The next orientation meeting for the After School Tutoring Program will be held Oct. 22 in the community building.

Report to Superintendent Giz Unified School District Giz, Mo.

FROM: Parent Teachers' Association, Kennedy School

SUBJECT: Annual Report from Visitation Day

Dear Dr. Leader:

During our visits last week to other school districts, our committee was much impressed by the reading program at Neighboring Unified School District. They have an excellent remedial program and a very well-planned and interesting in-service program. Many of the teachers are experimenting with individualized reading. Furthermore, the students seemed interested in reading, and many were checking out books to read at home.

Naturally, our committee noted that our school district also has an excellent program, but it might be worthwhile to consider some of these innovations in the reading program.

Respectfully yours,

N. Volved

N. Volved, President, PTA

Mrs. Smith
Mr. Jones
Mrs. Rogers
Mr. Brown

14 University Way
Marblehead, Indiana
August 12, 1969

Dr. R. Leader, Superintendent
U. S. D. of Giz, Mo.
161 School Lane
Giz, Mo.

Dear Dr. Leader:

Thank you so much for allowing me to use the District test scores in my research project this summer. The scores were most helpful and lent themselves well to the B582 research course. You may recall that the project on which I was working was a longitudinal comparison of aptitude test results with particular emphasis on any trends which might be apparent. I thought perhaps you might be interested in the results.

The study began with tests given in 1959 and included those given each spring through 1969. During the first five years of that period, all test scores seemed to be relatively stable when compared to the national norm with a slight rising trend shown in scores in social studies sub tests. However, since 1965, there has been a definite drop in scores in the social studies, reading, history, and English sub tests, while the scores in vocabulary, math, and science have remained steady. The tentative conclusion which I reached was that the only thing these areas have in common is the amount of reading involved--there being less reading in the spelling, math, and science sections than in the other areas. This factor may or may not be the cause of the drop in the other scores.

I'm looking forward to the start of school and to being a teacher again instead of a student!

Sincerely,

Ins Tructor

(Mrs.) Ins Tructor

IT/me

Didn't mike ask
Jon mention this
at a principals'
meeting last spring?

.....from the desk of R. Leader

Date August 18

To: Val U. Ator

Subject: Mrs. I. Rate

Another call from Mrs. R.--seems she read Flesch this summer and is all upset because Todd (2nd)--isn't reading the newspapers yet. Wants phonics! You'll be hearing from her! Good Luck. She carries a lot of weight in Benton School as president of their P.T.A.

GIZ SCHOOL SYSTEM
Interdepartmental Communication

TO: Val U. Ator

SUBJECT: In-service program

FROM: Dr. R. Leader, Superintendent

I understand through the grapevine that there was an in-service program about 18 months ago, before I came to the Giz School System. All past records concerning this project seem to have been mislaid. My secretary has informed me that the focus was on corrective reading for the disadvantaged. You might check this out as a possible aid to our upcoming project.

Sincerely,

R. L.

Dr. R. Leader, Supt.

Second day on the job:

You're called to Dr. Leader's office to discuss the Title I project. Dr. Leader makes it quite clear that the proposed project is to emphasize individualized reading. He does not seem to be quite sure what individualized reading is, but says he want you to find out what the school district is doing and should be doing in this area. In his conversation, he refers several times to the article he sent you, "Johnny Can't but Elmer Can in Big City," and also to the PTA report. He tells you to consider a plan for getting started.

Third day on the job:

Dr. Leader phones to discuss what you're doing to get started. He states that he knows how important evaluation is to good program development, and he wants a good evaluation to determine the district's progress in individualizing reading instruction. However, he emphasizes that time is going by and that the proposal must be ready by January 15. He asks if you can send him a report in four days outlining what steps you will take to start the program rolling. He seems somewhat irritated and ends the conversation by stating: "I hope you know we're on the spot in this thing. I can just hear them all hollering next spring if I don't have these evaluation reports in on time."

A memo arrives from Dr. Leader the next morning:

GIZ SCHOOL SYSTEM
Interdepartmental Communication

TO: Val U. Ator

FROM: Dr. Leader

SUBJECT: Title I Project

Sorry if I sounded upset on the phone, but I had just received a copy of the Title I evaluation form from Washington. I can't understand it at all. In any event, we'll probably have to complete something like this for the project proposal; but I don't think it follows the idea we've been talking about.

What I need from you is a report which includes--

1. A list of steps you're planning to take to determine needs in the area of reading we discussed.

2. Some procedure we can follow to assign priorities to the needs. The district has gotten into the situation in the past of trying to do all things at once, and I don't want that to happen again.

Do you think you could have this ready by next Wednesday? By the way, I thought you might like to visit the elementary schools to get to know the teachers and that sort of thing. I really don't think they'll be much help to you because they don't know much about evaluation. They still belive in standardized tests as the ultimate answer, and I think I know where you stand on that. In any event, the principals will be looking for you on Thursday and Friday this week. I think you'll enjoy meeting some of our principals. You'll like Mr. Crabtree over at Benton School; he has the Secretary of the Year, and he's a wonderful morale builder in that school. Anyway, you might like to browse around and have the principals show you the facilities. We have some really fine facilities for special services. We're very proud of them.

RESPONSE SHEET

In view of the two things that Dr. Leader asked you to have ready by next Wednesday, what notes would you make to yourself? These might be very brief plans or some general strategy to fulfill Dr. Leader's request.

AT WHAT POINT IN THE CIPP PROGRAM
ARE YOU NOW? _____

OMNISCIENT COMMENT

In order to determine needs, you might have decided to investigate the following areas:

1. What materials are now being used to teach reading?
2. How do the students perform on standardized tests?
3. What do the supervisors and teachers think the system needs?
4. Is there some community group that speaks for the schools involved with the Title I project?

(You may not be able to do all that by next Wednesday, but you at least make these notes on your pad.)

R. Leader also wants you to set up procedures and assign priorities. That one is a stumper. Where will you find criteria to assign priorities? You might have listed:

1. Does research say where to start with disadvantaged populations?
2. Should I ask for a committee to set criteria for priorities? They would know the school system better than I.
3. Has the reading supervisor sent out a questionnaire that would help? Better see him.

(That's right. Your alternatives seem quite tenuous at this point. You need more feel for what is going on.)

Individualizing reading instruction does not revolve around how one teacher tutors one child. As a matter of fact, the teacher cannot consider himself a private tutor.

Individualizing will necessarily involve the proper identification of student needs and the organization of students, teachers, materials,

facilities, the schedule, and perhaps the neighborhood community. At any rate, the evaluator must examine each of these elements as they presently exist to see if they are capable of promoting a greater individualization of instruction. In effect, he asks, "How is the classroom organized?" "How can I collect that information?"

AT WHAT POINT IN THE CIPP PROGRAM
ARE YOU NOW? Context Evaluation: Focusing

Thursday and Friday

You visit the schools and engage in conversation with several teachers. Over a cup of coffee at Benton School you listened to one teacher who registered a description of rather typical concerns of other teachers:

"Mr. Ator, you're just the person I need to talk to. All semester I've been tearing my hair out over a child in my room -- Fairlee is his name -- who is so disruptive, especially during reading, that I'm making no headway with my other students. And many of them are really fine children who want to learn. You can't imagine what it's like to have Fairlee in your room for a full six hours. He's constantly tapping his foot, or his pencil, or anything else he can lay his hands on: paper, or paper clips, anything. You get the idea. And when it is his turn to read, he obviously isn't with us. I have to take time out to help him find the place, sometimes even the right page. Well, it takes so long to get Fairlee settled down and with it, that by the time he's ready to begin reading we all know he isn't going to be able to read the material anyway. I think he could, if only he wanted to. He's not really an unintelligent child. Oh, another thing, he doodles. This at least is quiet, so I can live with it. But, in addition, when I've assigned paper work, Fairlee is out of his chair, every other minute, needing to talk to me, you know: 'What am I supposed to do with this? I don't understand what you mean.' Do you have any suggestions as to how I might handle this child? I really am at my wits end."

Teacher B: "I'm interested in what you have to say about this Mr. Ator since I also have a problem child. His difficulty is quite different, but I might be able to use the same technique."

In other schools, the faces were different but the complaints were similar. Almost universally they focused on some child who was a behavior problem during the reading period, or one who showed complete lack of interest in the materials that were used, or another who just didn't have the vocabulary to keep pace in the readers provided for the class. The teachers didn't discuss general group performance; their eyes were set on an example of a need -- a child with a problem and how they could help.

You have gained knowledge and experience from your visits to the schools. In addition, you know Dr. Leader wants to emphasize individualized reading. What steps will you take to determine needs? What procedure will you suggest to assign priorities?

RESPONSE SHEET

1. Steps to take.

2. Procedure to assign priorities.

AT WHAT POINT IN THE CIPP PROGRAM
ARE YOU NOW? _____

Suppose that your answer to R. Leader was the following memo:

TO: R. Leader, Superintendent DATE: Wednesday #2

FROM: Val U. Ator

SUBJECT: Title I Project Planning

In response to your request for an initial plan of action, I propose the following answers:

1. Steps to determine needs in individualizing instruction.
    1. Visit schools for informal reactions of teachers and principals. (Done last week).
    2. With help of reading supervisor examine existing reading texts to determine provisions for individualization.
    3. Do a spot survey of other reading materials in the classroom to see how they can be used for individualizing reading.
    4. Find out from community action group what kinds of personal instruction they see their children needing and what kinds they see them actually getting.
    5. Do a small sample check on the teachers' background for individualized reading instruction.
    6. Check to see if there are any tests that would indicate areas to emphasize in trying to individualize instruction.

2. Procedure to assign priorities.
    1. Establish a committee composed of the superintendent, the reading supervisor, the evaluator, four teachers, and two representatives of the community to establish the final criteria for selecting the priorities.
    2. Hold five or six discussions among teachers in various buildings to see how they would list the priorities for individualizing reading instruction -- facilities, in-service training, and other services.
    3. Have a sample group of teachers rank the needs of their Title I students -- their needs related to more individual attention.

AT WHAT POINT IN THE CIPP PROGRAM
ARE YOU NOW? Context

The next day Dr. Leader responds to your memo with a telephone call:

"Val, your plan looks fine. Let's get started right away. I think we can give you about one month to get the assessment job finished, and I'll see that you get some help in collecting the information that we need. Miss Overth Hill is the reading supervisor. As a task force, she and two of her reading teachers should be able to help you collect all the information you need within a month. In the meantime, I'll get the committee set up to help us decide priorities. We'll call it the Title I Curriculum Committee. You and your task force will be on the committee; I'll get the others together shortly. Oh, by the way, Val, any meetings that you hold with classroom teachers must be informal -- no public announcement. The union is already demanding decision-making power over salaries and the like. If we hold formal discussions, we'll have to do it every time we want to try some new project. Maybe you can tap the teachers through some kind of questionnaire or something."

RESPONSE SHEET

It is now your job to find in one month what the specific problems (needs) are for individualizing reading instruction. Using the steps that you outlined in your memo to R. Leader, what specific things are you and your task force going to look for? What instruments would you use? (Check Taxonomy of Evaluation Techniques)

Specific Information	Instrumentation

AT WHAT POINT IN THE CIPP PROGRAM ARE YOU NOW? _____

OMNISCIENT COMMENT

Students. Are the students all performing to the best of their ability? How many are failing reading or other subjects because of inadequate reading skills? Of those who fail, is there a significant discrepancy between their reading and their ability? Check school test records and interview teachers.

Teachers. How do teachers define individualized reading? Do they see themselves directing it? With how many students? The teachers had an in-service program eighteen months ago. Did it provide any skills that would help individualize reading instruction? How many teachers in the Title I schools participated in that course?

Perhaps through interviews you could determine whether the teachers have any knowledge of how to use information from group reading tests, or how many could use an informal reading inventory. Probably through a questionnaire you could ask the teachers how they view facilities, materials, school organization, and their own competency for individualizing reading instruction. See examples of instrumentation in the Taxonomy of Evaluation Techniques.

Materials. To individualize reading, it would be necessary for the teacher to have available a wide variety of materials, written at several levels of difficulty -- appropriate for the cultural groups that make up the population. Some hardware such as tape recorders and film-strip projectors would also be beneficial. A spot survey by a member of your task force should be able to estimate the availability of these items in the target schools. There are materials checklists in the taxonomy.

Facilities. The main concern with facilities is that they be flexible and, of course, available. Can chairs and book cases be shifted around to provide for various seating arrangements? Are there places open for

different kinds of activities? Is there a library or a learning center? Are there carrels for private work? Can temporary partitions set off corners of the room for specific activities?

Existing Program. Does the existing curriculum include individualizing reading as one of its objectives? Does it suggest specific plans of action? If so, why hasn't the plan worked so far?

Community. The community may provide activities or encouragement for individualizing reading using lending libraries, neighborhood tutors in reading and book clubs to get the right book into the hands of the right youngster. If they do not exist, would the community groups be willing to develop some of these activities and services?

The point. In the time you have for working on these exercises in this simulation package, you could not be expected to list all the things that were mentioned on the previous pages. It should be clear, too, that there are many other questions or suggested sources of information that could have been listed. The point is that a fairly complete description of the existing facilities and of the evident needs should be produced in order to decide on priorities for program planning.

You remember that, at Val's suggestion, Dr. Leader set up a Title I Curriculum Committee to establish the final criteria for assigning priorities to the determined needs. In addition, Dr. Leader organized a task force composed of the reading supervisor, two reading teachers, and Val as chairman to determine what the needs actually were. These two committees went to work immediately. We return now to Val and his task force to see what needs they found in the Giz system.

AT WHAT POINT IN THE CIPP PROGRAM
ARE YOU NOW? Context: analyzing data

GIZ SCHOOL SYSTEM
Interdepartmental Communication

TO: Title I Curriculum Committee

FROM: Task Force on Reading Needs, V. U. Ator, Chairman

SUBJECT: Needs for Individualizing Reading Instruction in Giz

1. A random selection of teachers from grades K-6 was found to have very positive attitudes concerning the need to individualize reading instruction.

2. A questionnaire survey of this random sample of teachers revealed that over 90 percent of the teachers feel that their graduate and undergraduate teacher training has not given them any training in the individualization of reading instruction. This feeling of inadequacy covers reading materials, instructional practices, and grouping procedures.

3. In most of the classes (over 80 percent) the children are divided into three groups for reading instruction. All three groups within a class use the same basal reader, but modifications are made for each group, primarily in the supplementary material used, the speed with which the children "go through" the material, and the depth of discussions regarding the comprehension of stories.

4. There are a number of sets of high-interest, low-vocabulary books available in each elementary school library. However, these are not being used by classroom teachers. Many teachers are not even aware of their existence.

5. A random testing of ten children from each grade level in each school revealed that over 50 percent of the children were being given reading instruction in materials which were at or over their frustration reading level according to the Bett's criteria. Ten percent of the children in this same sample were reading instructional materials at their independent reading level.

6. A study of last year's standardized test scores in reading revealed that the children in grades 1-6 in the Giz School District had an average score at about the 40th percentile for each grade. These results corroborated the findings of the study done last summer by Mrs. Ins Tructor.

7. A study of PTA committee reports, Board of Education minutes, local newspaper articles, letters to the editor column, seven visits to the local coffee house, and two haircuts at the community barbershop reveal a generally positive attitude toward the school program in general. However, most people are quite uninformed about the school program in general, as well as

GIZ SCHOOL SYSTEM
Interdepartmental Communication

curriculum innovations in specific areas. Most comments indicated that the community not only desires to do better, but also wants to be adequately informed about how things are going.

8. A study was conducted last year in each of the elementary school libraries to determine book evaluation. This study was requested because the Giz District received a sum of money through Title II of ESEA for increasing library materials. This study indicates that while circulation of the existing materials is fairly high, there is a very small percentage (less than 15 percent) of elementary children who have signed a book out more than once. These students, however, have signed out a great number of books.

RESPONSE SHEET

The task force's report listed eight items. Describe (create) two other pieces of relevant data that the task force might have collected if they had covered other areas of possible needs for individualizing reading. (Think about needs in your own school)

9.

10.

AT WHAT POINT IN THE CIPP PROGRAM
ARE YOU NOW? _____

The Title I Curriculum Committee accepted the "Needs Task Force Report" and produced the following report of its own.

Report from the Title I

Curriculum Committee

The following goals and criteria should govern the Title I Reading Program for the Giz Unified School District.

Broad Goal

Students should demonstrate continuous basic reading skill development. They should also be exhibiting positive attitudes toward reading.

In order to reach this broad goal, the curriculum committee proposes the following specific objectives:

Every student should be given reading instruction at his instructional reading level as determined by an informal reading inventory.

A report to this committee by our Title I Reading Evaluator reveals several discouraging facts about present attempts to reach this goal. We are, therefore, appointing a task force of this committee to propose alternative strategies for closing the gap between our objective and our actual situation. The task force should clearly delineate the strengths and weaknesses of each alternative according to the criteria below. Val U. Ator has been asked to serve as chairman of this group. Their report is to be presented to this total committee by November 15.

Criteria for Program Selection

1. The program should deal directly with the problem of getting children in appropriate reading levels.

2. The program should have impact in all elementary grades for all schools.

3. The program should make individualization of reading an effective force in everyday instruction.

RESPONSE SHEET

In light of the assessment and discussions that have taken place, are there criteria that should be added to the Curriculum Committee's report?

4.

5.

6.

Are there any changes you can suggest for the first three criteria?

AT WHAT POINT IN THE CIPP PROGRAM
ARE YOU NOW? _____

On November 15 the Title I Curriculum Committee met to review the following report on alternative program suggestions:

Task Force Report
Alternative for Individualizing Reading in Giz
(Val U. Ator, Chairman)

On the basis of the priorities established by the Title I Curriculum Committee, the special task force has produced five proposals for individualizing reading instruction in the School System of Giz. They are presented here with their major strengths and weaknesses. This process should assist the committee in making a decision about the kind of program that it would choose for Title I. The task force made use of research studies and relied upon the broad experience of Miss Overth Hill in listing these strengths and weaknesses.

The task force also made some informal decisions about the relative merit of each of these alternatives. It felt that the alternatives could be ranked according to their merits for Giz in this order:

1. In-service program for all Title I reading teachers on how to individualize reading instruction.
2. Provide $2,000 for each classroom teacher to purchase the materials and the assistance that will benefit him most in individualizing instruction.
3. Hire a reading specialist to work with those children who are considerable handicapped in reading.
4. Hire paraprofessionals to assist each teacher in the classroom.
5. Hire a specialist to work with teachers as an on-the-job trainer in individualizing instruction in reading.
6. Conduct a special summer school for those who have trouble with reading.
7. Reduce class size from 30 to 25.

Each of these suggestions is given below with an outline of their strengths and weaknesses. The task force will be happy to explain any of these alternatives.

Signed.

Val U. Ator

Overth Hill

June Smartack

Bjorn Looser

Dated: Wednesday, November 15

Strengths and Weaknesses of Alternatives
to Individualizing Reading Instruction

Alternative 1. Specialist working with children

Strengths

1. Expertise is applied to those who need it.
2. Small groups permit highly individualized program.
3. It frees teacher to work with average or better children.
4. Tangible, immediate gains are likely.
5. No additional demand is made on teachers' time.
6. The low cost is limited to the specialist's salary plus few materials.

Weaknesses

1. Only a small number is affected.
2. Space is needed for group.
3. Scheduling would present problems.
4. Finding qualified personnel is difficult.
5. It leaves teacher out--no change in institution.
6. Children may feel isolated as poor readers.
7. Teacher may feel using specialist labels him as poor teacher.

Alternative 2. Specialist working with teachers

Strengths

1. It involves large number of teachers.
2. It involves large number of children.
3. It places responsibility on teacher.
4. Long term effect on institution is likely.
5. There is no space as well as presenting scheduling problems.
6. Labeling and isolating poor readers is avoided.
7. There is a low cost (specialist's salary plus few materials).

Weaknesses

1. Expertise is spread thin.
2. No immediate gains are likely.
3. It makes demand in teachers' time outside classroom.
4. Finding qualified personnel would be difficult.
5. Specialist's personality must be effective in working with teachers.
6. Difficulty of coping with full range of reading ability from no ability to superior, in one classroom.

Alternative 3. Summer School

Strengths

1. It gives intensive help for poor readers (12 students per class).
2. The space and scheduling problems would not exist.
3. Teachers could experiment with new ideas.
4. Students may improve more when removed from the regular curriculum.

Weaknesses

1. With 12 pupils per class, the program could reach only a few of the poor readers.
2. Attendance may be a problem in the summer.
3. Students may regress if the regular program is not changed to continue work started in summer.

Alternative 4. Reduce Class Size, 30-25

Strengths

1. The teacher would have more time to spend with each child and a better opportunity to follow the students' progress.
2. More space and seating flexibility could be used.

Weaknesses

1. Instruction may not improve. The teachers usually do not individualize on the basis of a 5 pupil reduction.
2. More classroom space must be made available.

Alternative 5. Hire paraprofessionals

Alternative 6. Materials: $2000 per teacher to be spent by teacher

Alternative 7. In-service Program

RESPONSE SHEET

If you had been part of the task force to find alternatives for individualizing reading, what are the major strengths and weaknesses that you would have listed for alternatives 5, 6, and 7?

Alternative 5.
Strengths

Weaknesses

Alternative 6.
Strengths

Weaknesses

Alternative 7.
Strengths

Weaknesses

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now?_____

OMNISCIENT COMMENT

Listed below are some of the strengths and weaknesses that you might have given for the alternatives suggested by the task force headed by the evaluator. On your own list you may have indicated some that are more appropo than some of these.

Alternative 5. Hire paraprofessionals

Strengths
1. The teacher would be freed to spend more time planning and working individually with the students.
2. The paraprofessional could provide more one-to-one type drill work.
3. The one-to-one relationship with the paraprofessional provides more adult contact for the student.

Weaknesses
1. Teachers do not know how to use assistants.
2. There may be a problem finding and training qualified people.

Alternative 6. Materials: $2000 per teacher to be spent by teacher

Strengths
1. It encourages experimentation, and the new ideas may prove effective.
2. It involves the individual teachers, and perhaps they would be more enthusiastic about changes in reading.
3. It meets the specific needs of each class and teacher more completely.

Weaknesses
1. It would be difficult to evaluate the program.
2. Teachers may need new ideas rather than more materials.
3. It may be difficult to provide for transition between grades.
4. Teachers are not prepared to select materials or personnel.

Alternative 7. In-service Program

Strengths
1. It gets new information to the people who are in a position to apply it.

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? Input: alternatives

2. Fulfills the needs of teachers.
3. "Inspires."
4. Acts as a motivational factor.
5. Provides new ideas.
6. Helps those teachers who would not otherwise get any further schooling.

Weaknesses

1. Union will not approve after-school hours.
2. Instructors who relate program to the needs of teachers are hard to find.
3. There is no good central location for meeting.
4. Immediate effectiveness of program would be hard to measure.
5. Teachers are sometimes reluctant to devote extra time.

Curriculum Committee, Title I Reading

Meeting, November 15

On November 15 the Curriculum Committee reviewed the alternatives and priorities suggested by your task force. The committee thanked the task force and then discussed which alternatives should be selected for a program. At first the committee decided that it would start "at the top" and devote its energies to teacher training and to providing assistants who would help build the skills and attitudes of individualizing reading instruction. But the community action representatives felt that each child in the target schools should receive some direct benefit from the $100,000. For that reason, the committee decided to include the alternative of each teacher in the target area purchasing extra materials. Thus the committee concluded by saying that the Title I Reading Program for Individualizing Instruction should include in order of importance: 1) in-service training for target school teachers, 2) the hiring of resource teachers to aid in carrying out the developments of the in-service training, and 3) the purchase of extra student materials by the teachers in the classrooms.

The Curriculum Committee then submitted the following objectives for incorporation in the program:

1. To improve the reading skills of every child in the target area in grades 1, 2, and 3. Special emphasis was to be placed on early prevention problems.
2. To produce teachers who use diagnostic techniques for teaching.

3. To make teachers aware of current materials available for individualizing reading instruction.

The committee hammered out its objectives in detail and submitted them to you for your reaction.

Objectives are on attached sheet.

Objectives for Title I Program
Individualizing Reading Instruction

Objectives related to the in-service program:

1. To increase the teachers' knowledge of basal readers, kits, A-V tools, and tests (individual inventory, group diagnostic tests, and achievement and intelligence tests).

2. To increase the teachers' knowledge of the method of diagnostic teaching.

3. To institute the teachers' use of informal inventories.

4. To further the teachers' use of individual student files of reading progress.

5. To promote the application of the teachers' knowledge of sequential skill development.

6. To institute the teachers' use of varied types of reading materials and instructional tools.

7. To increase the reading level of each child to a greater degree than changes noted in past years.

Objectives related to materials:

1. To provide materials which are written at the appropriate reading levels for each individual child in the classroom.

2. To provide materials which may be used for the development of a systematic sequence of skills.

3. To provide materials which vary in content, type, length, and interest.

4. To increase the number of outside books read by the students.

Objectives related to resource teachers:

1. To hold monthly individual conferences with each classroom teacher to discuss individual problems and offer new ideas.

2. To observe each teacher periodically to assess and aid in the individualizing of reading instruction.

3. To acquire needed classroom materials which will enable each student to read at his instructional level.

RESPONSE SHEET

What do you think Val's reaction would be to the specific objectives selected by the Curriculum Committee? What is necessary for him to develop a good program plan?

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? _____

OMNISCIENT COMMENT

Val told the Curriculum Committee that a program could not be written on the basis of the objectives provided by the committee. "We wouldn't know where we were going!" he told the committee. "Let me draw up a list of more specific objectives--objectives we can live with and develop a program from. If those objectives meet with the approval of this committee, then we can get the program described and moving."

Val was given the job of developing more precise objectives. He was to have written a report to the committee by the following week.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Val's Report

Specific Objectives for Title I Reading Program

It was decided that the proposed Title I program would have three components: a formal inservice education program, resource teachers for continuing assistance, and materials for direct use by the youngsters in the classroom. The major goal of the program is to teach teachers about the diagnostic teaching of reading and the use of instructional materials that will assist in individualizing reading. The following specific objectives are an attempt to incorporate both the general objectives and the intent of the program in a list that can be used to develop procedures for carrying out the program.

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? Input: Specifying objectives

Objectives for the Title I Reading Program

In-service education for teachers

As a result of various in-service activities for teachers in grades one to three it is expected that the teachers will be able to--

1. List and describe the specific needs of disadvantaged children in their classes. Needs of children in the following areas will be included: general interest, social, academic, and emotional. The definition of disadvantagement as given in the Title I applicant's book will be used for this study.
2. List and define a developmental list of reading skills.
3. Define specific criteria for determining students' functional reading levels.
4. Select, develop, and administer a variety of measurement procedures and instruments for determining each child's instructional level and skill development as defined in objectives 2 and 3.
5. Select and demonstrate the use of a variety of reading materials that could be used to develop each child's reading level and skill development as defined in objectives 2 and 3.
6. Select and demonstrate the use of a variety of reading materials that are appropriate to the needs (interests, social, academic, and emotional) as described in objective 1.
7. Demonstrate the use of a variety of instructional procedures that are appropriate to the needs and reading skill development of each child.

8. Design a teaching strategy that will provide the instructor with immediate feedback of each student's performance of the reading skills listed in objective 2.

In addition to the in-service education of teachers, the project will provide funds for purchasing instructional materials which can be used to individualize reading instruction. The objective of this phase of the program is to provide the "appropriate" materials for each classroom. Specifically, the objective is to make avaoilable to each classroom a variety of instructional materials which--

1. Are appropriate to the specific needs of disadvantaged children in that classroom.
2. Include practice activities for the specific reading skill needs of the children in that classroom.
3. Are of the appropriate functional reading levels for the children in that classroom.

Your report is sent to the Curriculum Committee on schedule. Due to a stomach disorder you are unable to attend the meeting; but, you find this memo waiting on your desk when you return to the office:

GIZ SCHOOL SYSTEM
Interdepartmental Communication

TO: Val U. Ator

FROM: Dr. R. Leader, Superintendent

SUBJECT: Reading Program, Title I Project

Sorry you missed the Curriculum Committee meeting last night. Did you have those ulcers when I hired you in September?

Your detailed objectives have been accepted by the Curriculum Committee. A program task force composed of the elementary reading teachers and Dr. Readbetter, a specialist from Ohioana University, will use the objectives to develop the program. As soon as you get a copy of the program, let me know what you think.

I am pleased with the way things are progressing.

R. Leader

P.S. I have found yogurt very beneficial in trying to get on top of this ulcer thing.

Two weeks later you receive a copy of the proposed program. You must read it and react to Dr. Leader. Time is getting short. The proposal deadline is only a few weeks away.

(Task Force Report)

PROGRAM PLAN

Title I Reading Project on

Individualizing Reading Instruction

The intent and the specific objectives of this program are found in the report by Val U. Ator. This plan provides the guidelines to make the program optional.

INTRODUCTION. The intent of this program is to upgrade the knowledge and skills of the primary grade teachers in four elementary schools in the target area. The purpose of the program is individualizing reading instruction. Though the teachers receive guidance in two of the three components of the plan, the ultimate goal of that focus is to enable all students in the target area to read at a higher level than they are presently doing. To keep the student in mind, a third component of the program is a materials purchase plan whereby each teacher in the project has a sum of money to invest in classroom books and materials that will make reading more real and desirable to the disadvantaged children that he teaches.

Each of the three components will be described separately even though they are closely related. The parts form a sequence which makes it fairly simple to discuss them in separate units. The in-service training component will provide a base of knowledge and an opportunity to develop some essential skills for individualizing reading. Following the in-service training, it is the responsibility of the resource teachers to assist the classroom teachers in carrying out and extending the concepts and the skills developed during the in-service meetings. With

the guidelines provided by the in-service training and the recommendations of the resource teacher, the classroom teacher will then have adequate direction for choosing materials wisely.

In-service Component

Twenty-eight primary grade teachers from four target schools will participate in an intensive and extensive program on individualizing reading instruction.

Personnel. Under the direction of the Giz reading supervisor, Overth Hill, two consultants from outside the school district will plan and execute the specific tasks of the inservice program. One consultant should be a reading specialist, probably from the Ohiana University Reading Department. The second consultant should have background in reading education and should have a specialty in curricular programs for the disadvantaged or inner-city children. Occasionally speakers may be brought in to treat specialized content or to provide motivation.

Time. The program will be conducted in nine full days of activity divided as follows over the academic year: one full day a week for the first five weeks; one half day a month for the remaining eight months.

Place. Initial meetings will be held at the Board of Education central office conference room. At the discretion of the consultants and according to the needs of the teachers, subsequent meetings may be held in the target schools or other appropriate places.

Content. The Giz reading supervisor and the two consultants will prepare a detailed content outline at the start of the in-service

program. Generally the program will be geared to achieving the concepts and skills listed in the objectives for the in-service program. The content will include, therefore, a treatment of tests, materials, teaching plans and techniques for individualizing reading instruction for disadvantaged children.

Procedures. The in-service program will consist of a variety of learning experiences, each designed to achieve knowledge or a skill related to individualizing reading. To make the program effective, consultants will use these procedures as guided by the content of the program:

1. Lectures on substantive issues, such as research evidence on characteristics of disadvantaged learners.
2. Demonstration of teaching and testing techniques, using children in the demonstrations.
3. Small group/large group discussions, depending on the necessity for total involvement and reaction by participants.
4. Workshop activities to construct evaluation instruments and teaching tools.
5. A book and materials fair to display items useful in individualizing instruction to give teachers an opportunity to practice with some of the instruments.
6. Supervised testing session with one child in which the participant administers an informal inventory of his own construction.

Resource Teacher Component

Four master teachers will be hired, one for each of the elementary schools in the project, for the purpose of assisting the classroom

teachers on a continuing basis. These master teachers will be hired from the existing teacher staff if qualified applicants can be found. They should have a minimum of five years of teaching experience or the equivalent, have a major or a specialization in reading, and have demonstrated their ability to work with other teachers through previous in-service workshops or similar means. It is preferred that they have masters degrees; but, that qualification can be waived provided related experience is substituted.

Duties. The resource teachers shall work throughout the school day to assist the teachers in one building to individualize reading instruction. With the exception of providing a minimum of once-a-month group meetings for that building, the resource teacher shall provide the following assistance only upon the request of the classroom teacher:

1. Assist in the selection of books and materials that appeal to specific children and are written at their level.
2. Provide information about and directions for use of those items that were presented in the formal inservice training sessions.
3. Provide regular assistance in working out a diagnostic teaching plan for an individual or a group.
4. Demonstrate in the teacher's classroom some of the techniques and materials that can be used to individualize instruction for a particular student.
5. Give an individual diagnosis of a problem case as a service and as a demonstration of how to test and diagnose.

6. Have available for general use a file of materials and books appropriate for use by the disadvantaged population.
7. Conduct regular (monthly) group discussions related to individualizing reading.
8. Give an appraisal of teaching, especially as it relates to individualizing reading instruction.

Materials Component

Each of the project teachers will be alloted a sum of money to purchase books and materials that meet the individual reading needs of the children in his class. The original recommendation of $2,000 per classroom must be modified according to the overall budget of the project. A minimum of $1,000 per classroom must be made available. Teachers will select the materials on the basis of knowledge and criteria gleaned from the formal in-service training programs and from the personal recommendations of the resource teacher in the building. These purchases should make it possible for each child in the school to read at least five different books right from his classroom library.

All requisitions for these materials must be signed by the Building resource teacher and processed through the office of the Director of Federal Programs.

Budget

28 substitute teachers for 5 full days + 8 one-half days @ $20/day	- $ 5,040
4 resource teachers @ $10,000	- 40,000
2 consultants for 5 full days + 8 one-half days @ $300/day	- 5,400
materials	- 49,560
Total	- $100,000

RESPONSE SHEET

It seems as if the new Title I reading project is ready to be sent to the State Department for review. A series of general program and specific performance objectives has been prepared, and an operating plan is ready. In looking over the plan, Val realizes that it is incomplete.

From the point of view of an evaluator, what should be added to the plan in terms of objectives, implementation, or economy?

objectives

implementation

budget

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? _____

OMNISCIENT COMMENT

Having seen the list of refined objectives and the program plan, you may feel overwhelmed at the thought of trying to determine what needs to be added. It would be worthwhile, therefore, to review the manner in which an evaluator assesses a program plan as it develops.

The program plan--the objectives and the procedures of operation--is a fulcrum on which program evaluation balances. The plan reflects what was learned about the needs and the capabilities of the school system, and it sets up the behaviors and the machinery upon which the judgments of success and failure will be made. As an evaluator, therefore, you should spend considerable time and effort on this phase of the enterprise.

The program plan began when the curriculum committee decided that individualizing reading instruction would be accomplished best through emphasis on training teachers. At that point, your concern was the question: What program plan will best accomplish the overall goal? The answer produced some alternatives and a list of priorities based upon research.

Later you took on the job of refining the committee's objectives. You refined, expanded, and restated them in terms of specific behaviors.

You had to consider again the resources needed to accomplish the behavioral objectives and whether these resources were already available in the school system or if they had to be purchased. Were the books and the facilities ready for increased emphasis on individualization of instruction? What strategies could be used to gain acceptance

At what point in the CIPP Program
are you now? Input: planning details

of the objectives? Are the teachers and administrators willing and able to carry out a plan to increase individualization of reading instruction? Should some pilot study be run to acquaint the faculty with the idea before it becomes an operating entity?

The curriculum committee set up the basic framework of an implementation design. It said that the Title I program would consist of in-service meetings, resource teachers to provide continuing help, and materials for immediate use in the classroom. A special task force is assigned to write implementation procedures. As an evaluator, you assess the planned procedures on the basis of their relevancy, feasibility, and economy. You also expect the implementation plan to describe a plan for monitoring the ongoing program for there are many contingency decisions that may arise about what works for reaching the objectives of the program. What are the predicted questions that you will have to answer about the program? Will you be prepared to answer those questions on the basis of the program plan that has been submitted?

Thus, at the program planning stage, the content with which the evaluator works is objectives, resources, strategies, an implementation design, and a monitoring system. The criteria that you apply to that content are relevancy, feasibility, and economy. A chart might guide you in this phase of your work.

Intention: Individualize instruction through focus on teacher.				
Objectives	Procedures	Relevancy	Feasibility	Economy
1. 2. 3. 4.				

In view of the intention of the program, check off the matched objectives and procedures against the three criteria.

Relevancy. Is it designed to produce a behavior that will promote the individualizing of reading instruction? Is there evidence available?

Feasibility. Do we have receptive personnel and adequate facilities? Can we adjust to carry out the program?

Economy. Can the same goal be accomplished through another means involving less expense? Can we afford to do it well?

In order to answer those questions, you must turn to research evidence, consult the practitioners and the authorities, and examine critically the facilities and the materials involved.

In other words, your evaluation procedures would include turning to information resources on reading research, such as ERIC/CRIER, the clearinghouse on research in reading; calling on authorities, such as your consultants or those who have written extensively about individualizing reading; surveying the teachers to get their reactions to the objectives and proposed procedures; setting up a pilot program to see what has to be adjusted when the money becomes available and the full program begins; and, of course, applying logic and common sense.

Since it is practically impossible for us to go through all of those steps in these simulation training materials, let us assume that Val looked at these aspects of the program plan and applied the criteria. Let us further assume that he was generally satisfied with most of the implementation plan; but he failed to find a monitoring system in it.

GIZ SCHOOL SYSTEM
Interdepartmental Communication

TO: Dr. R. Leader DATE: December Before Christmas

FROM: Val U. Ator

SUBJECT: Program Plan for Title I

I have reviewed the program plan submitted by the task force. Generally it looks like a workable program.

One major fault that I see is that the task force did not suggest any plan for monitoring the implementation of the program or for appraising the program at the end of the year. In view of the tight schedule we have, I will draw up a monitoring plan and submit it to the task force. That should enable the task force to put objectives and implementation together for a project proposal before the January deadline.

Val

RESPONSE SHEET

What kind of strategy would you use in setting up a monitoring system for the program? Perhaps you could formulate a diagram that will assist you in knowing what data to collect, as well as knowing how and when to collect it, and how you will do it.

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? _____

OMNISCIENT COMMENT

A monitoring system should be based on the anticipated decisions that can be made about the project. The ability to make decisions depends on the flexibility of a program, the objectives of the program, and recycling possibilities (both immediate and long range). For example, should other teachers participate in a board-financed in-service program next year? A monitoring system must be planned to collect data regarding the on-going activities as well as the ultimate impact of the project. The monitoring system must examine the congruence between stated objectives and procedures and the observed growth toward objectives as well as the performance of procedures. The materials were found in all classrooms. Finally, the monitoring system must be designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the particular program that has been planned. This is often referred to as contingency evaluation. For example, the Superintendent of Giz School and certainly the Congress of the United States is interested in an evaluation of whether or not this particular program is meeting the broad goal of Title I of ESEA.

How can a monitoring system be planned to consider all these concerns? A first step is to identify those people concerned with the project who have decision-making power. Second, it is necessary to delineate as nearly as possible the decisions that can and need to be made and to plan measurement and observation schedules which will provide these decision makers with timely, reliable, and valid information that they need to make decisions.

At what point in the CIPP Program
are you now? Planning a monitoring system is part of Input Evaluation; carrying out the monitoring is part of process evaluation.

Sample headings for these steps are given below:

Decision Maker Types of Decision Data Collection

The chart on the following pages is an attempt to outline a possible structure for organizing a monitoring system for this project. The chart is not meant to be comprehensive, nor do we believe the only structure an evaluator might utilize. Any structure should, however, include some treatment of the major items on this outline.

The first column of the outline, Level of Decision, does not mean that one decision maker is more important than another, but rather it indicates that some decision makers are interested in a project on a micro-level and others on a macro-level.

The second column, Decisions, is one that is always undergoing expansion and modification; however, the evaluator must be able to anticipate as many of these decisions as possible. If he does not, he will be unable to provide the decision makers with valid information when they need it. These decision statements are determined from discussions with the project personnel and from an examination of the project plan.

The third column indicates whether the decision is concerned with congruence between what was planned and what occurred or with the contingency of what could have been achieved and what was achieved. Most of the immediate decisions of the project are concerned with congruencies while long-range decisions are concerned with contingencies.

The fourth and fifth columns are examples of the kinds of data and information that might be collected and of possible measures that might be used in order to collect these data and provide a basis for

making decisions. The final column indicates the time by when the decision will need to be made. This factor is extremely important for the evaluator to determine if he is to plan a schedule for data collecting that will provide information when it is needed. In the outline which follows, "continuously" is written in the Time of Decision column for most decisions. In reality, this would need to be more specific; even if decisions are to be continually considered, a schedule for collection of data should be made.

Title: Schema for Project Monitoring System

Level of Decision	Decisions	Con-tin-gency	Con-gru-ency	Data	Measures	Time of Decision
U.S.O.E.	Are Title I programs meeting the broad goals of ESEA?	X	X	Information pertinent to broad goals (See Applicant's Handbook)	Reports from Title I Director Mean gains of participants	When Title I of ESEA appears in Congress for refunding.
State Title I Office	Is this particular Title I program to be --refunded --expanded --receive smaller allocation --discontinued	X	X	Effectiveness of the program in meeting specified aims. Number of children (disadvantaged) gaining benefits from program's effects.	Reports from Title I Director Surveys of number of disadvantaged in program population Mean gains on pre- and post-measures standardized instru.	At the end of project year (fiscal year)
Superintendent/ Board of Education	What changes are to be incorporated into the program? --budget shifts --staffing --salary changes	X		Monitoring budgeting process Reports from supervisors on staffing needs	Questionnaires Semantic differentials Public opinion survey	March (or when budget is reassessed for next school year
	What is the effect of the program in meeting individual and community needs?	X		Random sampling of community support	Cost accounting analysis	
	How has the community been informed about the program's merits and needs?	X		Monitoring dissemination of information to media		

Level of Decision	Decisions	Con-tin-gency	Con-gru-ency	Data	Measures	Time of Decision
	What is the performance level of the staff?	X	X	Reports from supervisors, administrators	Checklists Observation	
	Should this program be financed by regular budget?	X				
Supervisors	Is there co-ordinated effort between consultants, resource teachers, and teachers in implementation of the program?	X	X	Monitoring effects of staff meetings	Interaction analysis at staff meeting	Continuously
	To what extent have skills and cognitive awareness of primary teachers been increased?		X	Data pertinent to increased teacher knowledge	Pre- and post-measures of teacher skill and knowledge of individualized instruction Attitude sample of semantic differential	
	What are the effects of consultants upon teacher change?		X	Sampling of teacher attitude	Checklist Questionnaire Observation	
	Are sufficient materials available for classroom and professional growth?		X	Quantity of material needed for continuing program		
Resource teachers	What changes are needed within the in-service program?	X	X	Effectiveness of the in-service program in generating change	Attitude scale of structured visitation	Continuously

Level of Decision	Decisions	Con-tin-gency	Con-gru-ency	Data	Measures	Time of Decision
	Are teachers responding favorably to consultant service?		X	Extent to which teachers employ consultant services	Assessment of consultant-teacher interaction through use of consultant's log book.	
	Are new techniques/ materials being implemented?		X	Effectiveness of teachers in locating, using techniques/materials	Sampling questionnaire on teacher construction/implementation of materials	
	Can teachers undertake and skillfully interpret I.R.I.'s and other informal/formal measures?		X	Comparison of pre-training and post-administration, interpretation.	Pre- and post-measures of ability to administer and interpret I.R.I. (video-tape) Interview	
Teacher	Are materials/strategies effective?	X	X	Extent to which gains in reading ability occur	Pre- and post-measures on formal and informal tests	Continuously
	What changes are effected in pupil attitude or aspirations?		X	Changes in pupil attitude	Attitude scales Observation	
	Are techniques for individualization employed?		X	Variety of reading levels diagnosed	Checklists on individual skill development	
	Is outside aid sought and accepted?		X	Effectiveness of supervisory aid in providing counsel	Time spent in consultation and professional growth	

Several months have passed. The project proposal on individualizing reading instruction went to the state office for Title I and was approved. You have been busy in the intervening months trying to get everyone ready for the start of the program. You have also been working on the projects for which you are personally responsible. You have been developing instruments for data collection, validating them, and instructing your assistants in how to use them. You have worked very hard at developing a reporting network. Various teachers and administrators have agreed to help you in the monitoring and data collection process. You have also made yourself more familiar with the decision makers and their idiosyncrasies. You must tailor each of your reports to the respective decision maker.

But the program is actually functioning now. You have to see whether all your planning will help in the efficient operation of the program and in fighting the fires that spring up.

As the new Title I reading project swings into operation, Val is busy with implementing the project monitoring system. This includes the development of a time table on which Val has listed decisions that are to be made, who is to make them, when the decisions are to be made, and procedures for collecting the data. In addition to decisions to be made, Val has listed a number of immediate and long-range objectives which are to be assessed during the project. Finally, Val has listed on his master plan points at which he is collecting data on the mechanical operation of the project.

To implement this design, Val continues to select and develop data gathering procedures; he meets with project personnel to discuss short-term objectives and to interpret data to various project people so decisions can be made.

Val has been gathering data on various random groups of teachers to determine if the in-service activities are having immediate effects on classroom practice. He has been informing Mrs. Ima Goodteacher, one of the resource teachers, of the results of these activities and is therefore somewhat surprised when he receives the following memo.

GIZ SCHOOL SYSTEM
Interdepartmental Communication

TO: Val

DATE: Halloween
Year #2

FROM: Resource Teacher

SUBJECT: Reading Program

Val--

I would like to arrange a conference with you as soon as possible. This is the second month of my classroom observations, and I find that several teachers are not attempting to change their program. This group seems to be led by Mrs. Doga Matic. She seems to feel that children are not capable of handling an individualized program and that more control is needed in the classroom. She sees nothing wrong with what she has been doing in the past.

I am afraid her influence may spread. I would like to talk with you before attacking the problem.

Ima Goodteacher

Ima Goodteacher

RESPONSE SHEET

As the project evaluator, what plan should you have made at the beginning of the project to answer Ima's memo? Obviously she has a problem. She has several alternatives, including not trying to influence Doga Matic. If you had not planned any data collecting at the beginning of the project in regard to this problem, what could you do now?

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? _____

OMNISCIENT COMMENT

Val's Working Notes

1. I should help Ima to see the problem as clearly as possible. My interpretation is that she is concerned because one (or more) of the teachers are not changing their classroom behaviors.

2. I will talk to her about the data we have been collecting on various random samples of teachers. These indicate that many teachers are making significant changes.

3. We should consider the possibility of more systematic data collecting on those teachers Ima thinks are most resistant to change. We should go cautiously on this, however.

4. I will discuss with her the results of some of the "cognitive knowledge tests." These indicate that almost all the teachers understand the ideas in the in-service project. I will also check specifically on Mrs. Matic's results.

5. I will discuss with Ima several possible alternative strategies for working with Mrs. Matic. Ima probably has several ideas along these lines, and we can examine the strengths and weaknesses of each.

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? Process evaluation

Shortly after Thanksgiving (Year #2), Val is confronted with another evaluation crisis. A memo arrives from R. Leader:

GIZ SCHOOL SYSTEM
Interdepartmental Communication

TO: Val U. Ator

Thanksgiving
Year #2

FROM: R. Leader

SUBJECT: Letter from Mrs. Brow

Val--

The attached letter was sent to me from Crabtree over at Benton. Mrs. Brow sounds pretty upset and I'd like to do something before this turns into something big. I'm considering sending out a memo to the parents of all the children whose teachers are taking part in this program. Can you give me some information on this? Has your evaluation been keeping tabs on the effect of teachers' absence on students' performance? Your initial studies didn't include any information about parents, did they? Let me know what you come up with.

Mr. Crabtree, Principal
Benton School

Dear Mr. Crabtree,

I understand from my son, Fairlee, that his teacher will not be in school all of next week. I sincerely hope she isn't ill and am going on the assumption that this is not the case since this seems to be a planned absence. Fairlee has been making wonderful progress with Miss Gone over the last few weeks, and I feel certain that one week of marking time with a substitute teacher will set him back so far that he will be unable to catch up and master second grade work by the end of school. I have spoken to a number of the other mothers in Miss Gone's room, and you can be assured I am not alone in my concern. I am hoping you will tell me how you can justify excusing a teacher from her duties for a whole week. Please keep in mind that not only our children's futures but our tax dollars are at stake.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Wrinkle Brow

Mr. Leader,
I wonder if this should be passed on to Mr. Ator and his curriculum committee.
Crabtree

RESPONSE SHEET

This space is for your working notes to respond to R. Leader's memo. What kinds of information would you gather to help Leader make a decision?

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? _____

OMNISCIENT COMMENT

Val's Notes

1. Discuss with Leader his interpretation of the memo in order to get a better understanding of the problem.
2. Determine how soon Leader feels he needs to act.
3. Suggest several facts he might consider before acting, and have plans ready for telling Leader how these can be done quickly. Possibilities include--
   a. Determining parent knowledge of the program through a telephone interview. A random sample of parents could be used.
   b. Collect information on the qualifications of the substitutes.
   c. Monitor classroom activities on the days teachers are absent for in-service program.
   d. Collect information comparing in-services program teachers' absences with the average absence rate.
4. Work with Leader to specify alternative plans to meeting the problem and help him to assess these. Consider criteria for selecting alternative to be followed.

At what point in the CIPP Program
are you now? Process: contingency decisions

Another memo arrives from R. Leader before the Christmas holidays.

GIZ SCHOOL SYSTEM
Interdepartmental Communication

TO: Val U. Ator

DATE: Christmas Year #2

FROM: R. Leader

SUBJECT: Pregnant Ladies

Val--

One of the four resource teachers has just announced that she will be resigning at the end of next month due to pregnancy. What information is available to help us decide whether to hire another resource teacher or to spend the extra money on materials?

This is a good year--only one pregnancy so far! By the way, how are your ulcers?

R. L.

RESPONSE SHEET

How would you respond to Leader's memo?

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? _____

OMNISCIENT COMMENT

Val's Notes

1. The problem is clear and the alternatives have been delineated. The job is to gather information to assess the alternatives.

2. Your response to Leader might go something like the following:

GIZ SCHOOL SYSTEM
Interdepartmental Communication

TO: Dr. R. Leader DATE: Christmas

FROM: Val U. Ator

SUBJECT: Resource Teachers

Concerning the question as to whether to hire another resource teacher or use the money to buy materials, I have reviewed the teachers' monthly reports and have gleaned from them their reactions to the resource teachers. I have also surveyed the resource teachers' log books which contain a listing of their activities and requests for assistance. I had the principals ask for the teachers' comments on their desire for more materials. The information I have collected is this:

1) Most teachers feel that the resource teachers are contributing much to the new program.

2) Many teachers are requesting individual help sessions or demonstration lessons. All resource teachers have a busy schedule.

3) There have been few comments about the lack or inadequacy of materials. Teachers seem to feel they need to explore the possibilities of the materials already acquired.

P.S. My ulcers are relatively calm. I took your suggestion about eating yogurt. MERRY CHRISTMAS!

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? Process: congruency decision

A memo arrives from the A-V Director.

GIZ SCHOOL SYSTEM
Interdepartmental Communication

TO: Val U. Ator DATE: New Year

FROM: Sal Video, Director of A-V Services

SUBJECT: Circulation of A-V Materials

Val--

The new A-V materials have been sitting here in the central office for two months now. Only a few items have been checked out, and few teachers have visited the office. I'm very excited about this new equipment and would like to see it in use.

Sal

RESPONSE SHEET

Respond to the A. V. Director. What are reasons for trouble, and how can you help Mr. Video decide on how to get things moving?

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? _____

Val's Possible Response

TO: Sal Video

FROM: Val U. Ator

I am aware of the problem concerning the A-V materials. I have reviewed the resource teacher's monthly reports on this topic, the A-V circulation log, and I have sampled teachers' opinions by interviewing.

I have isolated the following possible reasons for the lack of use of the new equipment:

1. Teachers feel uneasy about the actual mechanical operation of some of the equipment. The ways in which the equipment may be used has been demonstrated, but there hasn't been much practice with the mechanics.
2. Teachers find it inconvenient to visit the material center to check out equipment. Some teachers have never been to the new center, and a few do not know where it is located.

I would suggest these possible alternatives:

1. Have a materials center open house.
2. Develop a more efficient method of ordering and distributing the equipment.
3. Plan a short session where teachers actually practice using the equipment.

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? Process evaluation: management of procedures

An educational evaluator often may be called upon to provide help in "crisis" decisions--some minor, some quite important. The important point is that if he has the monitoring machinery operating, he can assist the decision makers in modifying the program where the evidence shows a need to change objectives or procedures. For example, if reports from the resource teachers indicated that the classroom teachers were not calling upon them for observing teaching and offering suggestions for improvement, it might be necessary to modify the operational guideline that said the resource teacher would observe in the classroom only when asked by the classroom teacher.

The first year of the Title I reading program progressed without too much trouble. Val had other occasions where a decision maker needed data to solve a crisis. But his ulcer calmed down along the way and that seemed to say something for the project. Val knew that at the year's end he had to prepare some summary statements about the effectiveness and worth of the program. He looked at his monitoring plan to see who the major decision makers were and began jotting notes on the kind of final report he would need to write.

RESPONSE SHEET

From what you know of the Giz School System and its Title I reading program, can you determine the consumer groups of final report information and the kinds of reports they would need? In other words, how many different reports will you have to prepare in order to meet the needs of the decision-maker consumer?

Decision-making consumer	Brief description of report aimed at a specific consumer's needs

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? _____

OMNISCIENT COMMENT

Most evaluators will find it necessary to prepare several "product" or "summative" reports. The following are examples of the kinds of reports you may have listed as part of your working notes.

Decision-making consumer	Brief description of report aimed at a specific consumer's needs
Dr. R. Leader	1. Analysis of problem area 2. Future plans revisions 3. Alternatives of program improvement and budget revision recommended
Board of Education	Progress report: Summary of year's activities and "State of Union" report.
Task Force Committee Curriculum Committee In-service Committee State Title I Office	1. Evaluation of objectives 2. Problem areas 3. Equipment and materials, inventories and equipment--usage charts 4. Student progress reports 1. Statistical report 2. Narrative report 3. Evaluation
U. S. O. E.	Formal report of activities, students involved

At what point in the CIPP Program are you now? Product evaluation